



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,175	06/26/2003	Peter David White	1145-222	5191
23524 7590 04/10/2007 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 150 EAST GILMAN STREET P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 53701-1497			EXAMINER ANDERSON, JAMES D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,175	Applicant(s) WHITE ET AL.	
	Examiner James D. Anderson	Art Unit 1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27-29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed 1/16/2007, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Status of the Claims

Claims 10-29 are currently pending and are the subject of this Office Action. Claims 21-26 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim recites that B is "one or more amino acids or peptides". However, one or more amino acids is a peptide. As such, recitation of "one or more amino acids" and "peptides" is redundant. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 1614

applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 recites the limitation "...might be substituted by..." This is indefinite because it is not clear if the substitution is or is not present. Amending the claim to recite "optionally substituted by" would overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (1st Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a Written Description rejection.

The claims recite the limitation wherein X is "a functionality for attachment to a solid support or a functionality comprising the solid support". The specification discloses one example of a functionality for attachment to a solid support (e.g., page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 6). Claims 19-20 are limited to compounds of Formula I wherein X is $-D-R^5-E$ (wherein D is CH_2 , S, NH or O; R^5 is C_1-C_{10} alkyl; and E is COOH, OH, SH, NCS, NCO, NH_2 , Cl, Br, I or the solid support) and are therefore not included in this rejection. The specification does not disclose any other functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support as broadly encompassed in the claims.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In the instant case, the only factor present in the claims is a recitation of " a functionality for attachment to a solid support or a functionality comprising the solid support ". However, the specification does not describe the structural features of these functionalities, other than those wherein X is $-D-R^5-E$ (wherein D is CH_2 , S, NH or O; R^5 is C_1-C_{10} alkyl; and E is COOH, OH, SH, NCS, NCO, NH_2 , Cl, Br, I or the solid support). Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus.

Although drawn to the DNA arts, the findings in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) and *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.* are relevant to the instant claims. The Federal Circuit addressed the application of the written description requirement to DNA-related inventions in *Lilly*. The court stated that, "[A] written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name', of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials. " *Lilly* at 1567, 43 USPQ2d at 1405. The court also stated that:

"[A] generic statement such as 'vertebrate insulin cDNA' or 'mammalian insulin cDNA' without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One

Application/Control Number: 10/607,175

Art Unit: 1614

skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is." *Id.* at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

The court concluded that "naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material." *Id.*

Finally, the court addressed the manner by which a genus of cDNAs might be described. "A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." *Id.*

The Federal Circuit has recently clarified that a DNA molecule can be adequately described without disclosing its complete structure. See *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 296 F.3d 1316, 63 USPQ2d 1609 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The *Enzo* court adopted the standard that "the written description requirement can be met by show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics, *i.e.*, complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics." *Id.* at 1324, 63 USPQ2d at 1613 (emphasis added, bracketed material in original).

While the inventions at issue in *Lilly* and *Enzo* were DNA constructs *per se*, the holdings of those cases are also applicable to claims such as those at issue here (which are drawn to functionalities defined only by their intended purpose, in this case, for attachment to a solid support). The instant specification may provide an adequate written description of

Art Unit: 1614

functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support, per *Lilly*, by structurally describing representative functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support (e.g., specific structures, substituents, etc.), or by describing "structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus." Alternatively, per *Enzo*, the specification can show that the claimed invention is complete "by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics."

In this case, the specification does not directly describe functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support useful in the claimed invention in a manner that satisfies either the *Lilly* or *Enzo* standards. Although the specification discloses the residue $-D-R^5-E$ as a functionality for attachment to a solid support, this does not provide a description of the broadly claimed functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support that would satisfy the standard set out in *Enzo* because the specification provides no functional characteristics coupled to structural features (i.e., what residues or structures, for example, impart the claimed functionality). Further, the specification also fails to describe functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support by the test set out in *Lilly* because the specification describes only one such functionality ($-D-R^5-E$). Therefore it necessarily fails to describe a representative number of such species.

Thus, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of functionalities for attachment to a solid support or functionalities comprising the solid support that is required to practice the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102



The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 10-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,488,058 (Issued Sep. 10, 2002; Filed Sep. 11, 1998).

The '058 patent teaches compounds having the following structures:



wherein b is an integer from 1 to 5 and P_1 is a protecting group selected from the group consisting of trityl, *p*-methoxytrityl, *p*-methyltrityl, acetimidomethyl, benzyl, *t*-butyl, *t*-butylthio and *p*-methoxybenzyl protecting groups (col. 9, line 47 to column 10, line 65). These compounds anticipate the instantly claimed building blocks of Formula I when: X is $-D-R^5-E$, wherein D is O, R^5 is C_1-C_{10} alkyl and E is COOH or the solid support; R^1 and R^4 are $-OCH_3$; R^2

Art Unit: 1614

and R³ are H; Z is H; m is 0; n is 1; B is Fmoc (an amino protecting group); K is a straight chain alkyl; and C is protected SH.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 27-29 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James D. Anderson whose telephone number is 571-272-9038. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI 9:00 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/607,175

Page 9

Art Unit: 1614



James D. Anderson, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
AU 1614

March 30, 2007

Phyllis Spivack
PHYLLIS SPIVACK
PRIMARY EXAMINER 3/30/07